

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended, where appropriate, to overcome the claim objections. It appears that the final claim objection was intended to refer to Claim 10, rather than Claim 9.

The claims have also been amended, where appropriate, to recite distinguishing features of the invention more precisely. The claims now clearly distinguish patentably from Geiger, relied upon in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Incidentally, Applicant respectfully takes issue with the allegation in the rejection that the shape and appearance of Geiger is identical in all material respects to that of the claimed design. To the contrary, there are very important differences.

Independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a single pair of thread engaging sections formed at opposite sides of a tip end of the thick section, one or another of the engaging sections being disposed for entering a space between crests of threads of a stud depending on a direction of insertion of the stud in the bore, a single pair of grooves formed adjacent to corresponding engaging sections, each groove

being disposed for receiving a crest of a thread adjacent to the space between crests, and wherein the thick section of the pawl between the grooves and the thin section is devoid of thread engaging sections and grooves corresponding to thread engaging sections.

It is apparent from Figs. 14-16 of Geiger that the pawl 70 has a series of stepped teeth longitudinally spaced to engage with a series of threads 31 on a bolt, as shown in Fig. 16. This engagement occurs with the pawl 70 wedged between the threads 31 and a sidewall of the bore, as shown in Fig. 16.

To the contrary, in Applicant's invention, as shown in Fig. 3 of Applicant's drawings, for example, for a given bolt insertion direction, there is only one engagement section (e.g., 10b) that enters a space between crests of the threads 31, and there is only one groove (e.g., 11b) disposed for receiving a crest of a thread adjacent to the space between the crests. This is now clear in amended Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 and dependent Claims 4, 5 and 12 distinguish patentably from Geiger and should be allowed. With regard to Claims 4 and 5, it is apparent from Fig. 14 of Geiger that the steps 70 and the grooves therebetween are not curved.

The prior art rejection of Claim 3 is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 has been made independent by incorporating the subject matter of original Claim 1 (amended to overcome the claim objection). It is apparent from Fig. 16 of Geiger that after insertion of a stud in the bore the centerline of the pawl 70 is essentially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the stud and does not form an angle substantially less than 90° from the centerline of the pawl before insertion of the stud. For comparison with Geiger, see Fig. 3, for example, of Applicant's drawings. Accordingly, Claim 3 should be allowed.

The prior art rejection of Claim 6 (and the claims dependent thereon) is also respectfully traversed. Claim 6 recites that the pawl has a centerline extending in a first direction substantially perpendicular to an axis of the bore before insertion of a stud in the bore and forming an angle of substantially less than 90° with respect to the first direction after insertion of the stud in the bore, unlike Geiger. The claim further recites that the pawl has a thread engaging section at a pawl tip that enters a space between successive crests of threads of a stud and has an adjacent groove that receives one of the crests of the thread, and recites that the pawl has a length between the

groove and the hinge that is devoid of thread engaging sections and thread crest receiving grooves.

From the earlier discussion of Geiger, it is apparent that Claim 6 distinguishes patentably from Geiger and should be allowed along with the claims dependent thereon. Furthermore, with regard to Claim 10, it is apparent from the foregoing discussion of Geiger that the stepped teeth of pawl 70 of Geiger (and the grooves therebetween) are not curved.

This application is now believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (A-9923) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Nelson H. Shapiro  
Nelson H. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
703) 903-9000  
June 26, 2006  
NHS:kss